arXiv:1207.0749v1 [math.FA] 3 Jul 2012

ON THE INVERSE OF THE SUM OF TWO SECTORIAL OPERATORS

NIKOLAOS ROIDOS

Abstract. We study an abstract linear operator equation on a Banach space by using the inverse of the sum of two sectorial operators. We prove that the boundedness of a special type of operator valued H^∞-calculus is sufficient for maximal regularity of the solution. We apply the result to the abstract parabolic problem, to give a maximal L^p-regularity condition. We also study the abstract hyperbolic problem and give a sufficient condition for the existence of solution.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider an abstract linear operator equation on a Banach space E of the form

$$(A+B)x = y, \tag{1.1}$$

where A, B are closed linear (resolvent) commuting operators. The importance of the above equation is that instead of considering the equation on E we can consider it on the E-valued L^p space $L^p(0,T;E)$, for some $T > 0$ and $p \in (1,\infty)$, and take B to be the first or the second derivative with respect to $t \in (0,T)$, with appropriate boundary conditions, to obtain the abstract parabolic and hyperbolic problem respectively (i.e. the first and second order abstract Cauchy problem). In such problems we are interested in sufficient conditions for the existence of a solution and also the regularity of solution.

In [7], it has been shown that the sectoriality property for the operators A and B (i.e. the good asymptotic behavior of the resolvents in some sectors) is sufficient for the existence of a unique solution of (1.1), for any $y \in E$, which also depends continuously on y. From the analysis there, it follows that the closedness of the sum of the two closed operators A and B is connected to the *maximal regularity* of the solution, i.e. to the fact that the solution belongs to the intersection of the domains $\mathcal{D}(A)\cap\mathcal{D}(B)$. The last property plays an important role in the approach of the nonlinear problems (see [2]). In [3] the problem (1.1) is studied in the case of a UMD space E, for sectorial operators having bounded imaginary powers, and a sufficient condition is given for the closedness of the sum and hence for the maximal regularity of the solution. An application to the first derivative is also given. In [4] by using the connection between the boundedness of the joint functional calculus and the closedness of the sum for two sectorial operators (see Proposition 2.7 in [6]), another answer is given to the maximal regularity question, by requiring bounded H^∞-calculus to one of the operators and Rademacher boundedness to the other.

In section 2 of this paper we study the problem (1.1) in a classical sense, by using a formula for the inverse of the sum of two operators. The formula we use is the same as in [7]. Nevertheless, we apply a different approach by means of complex powers of the operators. Namely, we regard the inverse of the sum of the operators restricted to the images of complex powers with negative real part. In this way, we prove the same results as in [7] concerning the interpolation spaces. Moreover, in a similar approach, by considering the inverse of the sum on the image of the analytic continuous semigroup generated by at least one of the two operators, we see (Theorem 2.1) that we can impose a weaker condition for the closedness of the sum than that one of the bounded operator valued H^∞-calculus (Proposition 2.1). Hence, we find that a sufficient condition for the sum to be closed is that one of the two operators, which has to be a generator of an analytic bounded semigroup, has to admit a bounded H^∞-calculus for operator-valued holomorphic functions of exponential decay. In the third section, we apply the abstract result to the first derivative. In section four we study the abstract hyperbolic problem. Since the second derivative is not a sectorial operator, we treat the problem by defining the inverse of the sum in a special way and proceed by using sectorial projections. The results we obtain are of maximal regularity for the solution but not for all y in E. We show that a sufficient condition for the above is that in addition to the classical

---

Date: July 4, 2012.

sectoriality property, the operator has also to admit a behavior similar to the sectoriality on the right hand side of a parabola (see Definition 4.1).

2. THE INVERSE OF A+B

Definition 2.1. *(Sectorial operators) Let E be a Banach space, $K \geq 1$ and $\theta \in [0, \pi)$. Let $\mathcal{P}_K(\theta)$ be the class of closed linear operators in E such that if $A \in \mathcal{P}_K(\theta)$, then*

$$S_\theta = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, |\arg z| \leq \theta\} \cup \{0\} \subset \rho(-A) \quad \text{and} \quad (1+|z|)\|(A+z)^{-1}\| \leq K, \quad \forall z \in S_\theta.$$

Also, let $\mathcal{P}(\theta) = \cup_K \mathcal{P}_K(\theta)$.

If $A \in \mathcal{P}(\theta)$, then by a sectoriality extension argument (see the Appendix) we can always assume that $\theta > 0$.

Definition 2.2. *For any $\rho \geq 0$ and $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, let $\Gamma_{\rho,\theta}$ be the positively oriented path*

$$\{\rho e^{i\phi} \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, \theta \leq \phi \leq 2\pi - \theta\} \cup \{r e^{\pm i\theta} \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, r \geq \rho\}.$$

If $\rho = 0$, we denote $\Gamma_{\rho,\theta}$ by Γ_θ.

We define next a special type of bounded H^∞-calculus, for holomprphic operator valued families which decay exponentially in the complement of the sector of a sectorial operator.

Definition 2.3. *Let E be a Banach space and $A \in \mathcal{P}(\theta)$. Let $H^{e,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$ be the space of all bounded holomorphic functions $f : \mathbb{C} \setminus S_\theta \to \mathcal{L}(E)$ such that $f(\lambda)$ and $(A+z)^{-1}$ commute for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_\theta$ and $z \in S_\theta$, and*

$$\|f(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(E)} \leq c|\lambda|e^{-\delta|\lambda|}, \quad \text{for any } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_\theta,$$

for some c, δ depending on f. Any $f \in H^{e,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$ can be extended to non-tangential values in ∂S_θ, and defines an element in $\mathcal{L}(E)$ by

$$f(-A) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_\theta} f(\lambda)(A+\lambda)^{-1} d\lambda.$$

We say that A admits a bounded $H^{e,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$-calculus if $\|f(A)\|_{\mathcal{L}(E)} \leq C_A \|f\|_\infty$ for any $f \in H^{e,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$, where C_A is independent of f and $\|f\|_\infty$ is the supremum norm of $\|f(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(E)}$.

Since we regard only commuting operators, we recall the following definition.

Definition 2.4. *Two closed linear operators A, B in a Banach space E are resolvent commuting if there exist some $\lambda \in \rho(-A)$ and $\mu \in \rho(-B)$ such that*

$$[(A+\lambda)^{-1}, (B+\mu)^{-1}] = 0.$$

At the following we will use (without mention it) Lemma 4.9.1 in [1]. The first part of next theorem is contained in the results of [7].

Theorem 2.1. *Let E be a Banach space, $A \in \mathcal{P}(\theta_A)$ and $B \in \mathcal{P}(\theta_B)$ be resolvent commuting with $\theta_A \geq \theta_B$ and $\theta_A + \theta_B > \pi$. Then, $A + B$ with $\mathcal{D}(A+B) = \mathcal{D}(A) \cap \mathcal{D}(B)$ is closable and the following equation*

$$\overline{(A+B)}x = y,$$

for any $y \in E$, has a unique solution $x \in \bigcap_{\theta<1}(E, \mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,q} \cap (E, \mathcal{D}(B))_{\theta,q}$, for any $q \in [1, \infty)$, given by

$$x = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_B}} (A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1} y\, dz.$$

If

$$y \in \bigcup_{\theta>0} (E, \mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,p} \cup (E, \mathcal{D}(B))_{\theta,p},$$

for some $p \in [1, \infty)$, then $x \in \mathrm{D}(A) \cap \mathrm{D}(B)$.
Moreover, if A admits a bounded $H^{e,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta_A)$-calculus, then $x \in \mathrm{D}(A) \cap \mathrm{D}(B)$ for any $y \in E$ and

$$\overline{(A+B)} = A + B.$$

Proof. Let the bounded in E operator

$$\mathcal{K}=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}dz. \tag{2.2}$$

By a sectoriality extension argument and Cauchy's theorem, in the above integral formula we can replace the path Γ_{θ_B} by $c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}$ for some $c\in\mathbb{R}$ sufficiently closed to zero. Also, we can assume that $\theta_A>\theta_B$.

Let $y\in(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta',p}$ for some $0<\theta'<1$ and $p\in[1,\infty)$. Then, by I.2.5.2 and I.2.9.6 in [1], $y\in\mathcal{D}(A^{\theta})$ for any $0<\theta<\theta'$. If we take $c<0$, then by the standard way of defining fractional powers for sectorial operators (see Theorem III.4.6.5 in [1]), for sufficiently small $\rho>0$ and the path Γ_{ρ,θ_A}, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}y&=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}A^{-\theta}A^{\theta}ydz\\
&=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(A+\lambda)^{-1}d\lambda\Big)A^{\theta}ydz\\
&=\Big(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\Big)^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(B+z)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(A-z)^{-1}(A+\lambda)^{-1}A^{\theta}yd\lambda dz\\
&=\Big(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\Big)^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(B+z)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(z+\lambda)^{-1}\big((A-z)^{-1}-(A+\lambda)^{-1}\big)A^{\theta}yd\lambda dz\\
&=\Big(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\Big)^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(z+\lambda)^{-1}A^{\theta}yd\lambda dz\\
&\quad-\Big(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\Big)^2\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}(A+\lambda)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(z+\lambda)^{-1}A^{\theta}ydzd\lambda,
\end{aligned}$$

where at the last step we have used Fubini's theorem. By Cauchy's theorem, the first term in the right hand side of the above equation is zero, and hence

$$\mathcal{K}y=-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda. \tag{2.3}$$

Since for any sectorial operator T, $T(T+z)^{-1}=I-z(T+z)^{-1}$ is uniformly bounded in z inside the area of the sectoriality, the integrals

$$\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}A(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda \text{ and } \int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}B(B+\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda$$

converge absolutely. Hence, by (2.3), $\mathcal{K}y\in\mathcal{D}(A)\cap\mathcal{D}(B)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
A\mathcal{K}y&=-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}A(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda,\\
B\mathcal{K}y&=-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}B(B+\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
(A+B)\mathcal{K}y&=-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(A+B)(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda\\
&=-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(A-\lambda+B+\lambda)(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda\\
&=-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}\lambda^{-\theta}A^{\theta}yd\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right hand site on the above equation is zero by Cauchy's theorem. Hence, by the definition of the complex powers for A, we find that

$$(A+B)\mathcal{K}y=A^{-\theta}A^{\theta}y=yI.$$

Let now that $y \in (E, \mathcal{D}(B))_{\theta',p}$. Then, similarly to the previous case, $y \in \mathcal{D}(B^{\theta})$. If we take $c > 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}y = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}} & (A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}B^{-\theta}B^{\theta}ydz \\
= & \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(B+\lambda)^{-1}d\lambda\big)B^{\theta}ydz \\
= & (\frac{1}{2\pi i})^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(B+z)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}B^{\theta}yd\lambda dz \\
= & (\frac{1}{2\pi i})^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(\lambda-z)^{-1}\big((B+z)^{-1}-(B+\lambda)^{-1}\big)B^{\theta}yd\lambda dz \\
= & (\frac{1}{2\pi i})^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(\lambda-z)^{-1}B^{\theta}yd\lambda dz \\
& -(\frac{1}{2\pi i})^2\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}(\lambda-z)^{-1}B^{\theta}ydzd\lambda,
\end{aligned}$$

where at the last step we have used again Fubini's theorem. By Cauchy's theorem we find that

$$\mathcal{K}y = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}B^{\theta}yd\lambda. \tag{2.4}$$

Since both integrals

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}A(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}B^{\theta}yd\lambda, \quad \int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}B(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}B^{\theta}yd\lambda$$

converge absolutely, we have that $\mathcal{K}y \in \mathcal{D}(A) \cap \mathcal{D}(B)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
A\mathcal{K}y &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}A(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}B^{\theta}yd\lambda, \\
B\mathcal{K}y &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}B(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}B^{\theta}yd\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
(A+B)\mathcal{K}y = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}} & (A+B)(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}B^{\theta}yd\lambda \\
= & \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-\lambda+B+\lambda)(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}B^{\theta}yd\lambda \\
= & \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\phi}B^{\phi}yd\lambda + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta}B^{\theta}yd\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

The last term in the above equation is zero by Cauchy's theorem, and by the definition of the complex powers for B, we find that

$$(A+B)\mathcal{K}y = B^{-\theta}B^{\theta}y = yI.$$

Now take $\phi \in (0,1)$ and any $y \in E$. Then, by (2.3), there is

$$A^{\phi-1}\mathcal{K}y = \mathcal{K}A^{\phi-1}y = -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}z^{\phi-1}ydz.$$

Since the integral

$$\int_{-\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_A}}A(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}z^{\phi-1}ydz$$

converges absolutely, we have that $A^{\phi-1}\mathcal{K}y \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, which implies that $\mathcal{K}y \in \mathcal{D}(A^{\phi})$ (by the properties of the complex powers of an operator, see Theorem III.4.6.5 in [1]). Thus, by I.2.9.6 and I.2.5.2 in [1], we have that $\mathcal{K}y \in (E, \mathcal{D}(A))_{\phi',q}$ for any $0 < \phi' < \phi$ and any $q \in [1, \infty)$.

Similarly, by (2.4) we have that

$$B^{\phi-1}\mathcal{K}y=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(-z)^{\phi-1}ydz.$$

Since the integral

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}B(B+z)^{-1}(-z)^{\phi-1}ydz$$

converges absolutely, we obtain that $B^{\phi-1}\mathcal{K}y\in\mathcal{D}(B)$, or that $\mathcal{K}y\in\mathcal{D}(B^{\phi})$. Hence, we find as before that $\mathcal{K}y\in(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\phi',q}$.

Let $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{D}(A+B)$ such that $x_n\to 0$ and $(A+B)x_n\to y$ as $n\to\infty$. There is

$$x_n=(A+B)\mathcal{K}x_n=\mathcal{K}(A+B)x_n\to\mathcal{K}y,$$

which implies that $\mathcal{K}y=0$. By the relation

$$A^{-1}B^{-1}y=(A+B)\mathcal{K}A^{-1}B^{-1}y=(A^{-1}+B^{-1})\mathcal{K}y, \tag{2.5}$$

we find that $y=0$, or that $A+B$ is closable. That $\overline{(A+B)}\mathcal{K}y=y$, for any $y\in E$, follows by the density of $\bigcup_{\theta>0}(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,p}\cup(E,\mathcal{D}(B))_{\theta,p}$ in E, for any $p\in[1,\infty)$.

For the closedness of the sum of the two operators, let that $\{\tilde{x}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{D}(A+B)$ such that $\tilde{x}_n\to\tilde{x}$ and $(A+B)\tilde{x}_n\to\tilde{y}$ as $n\to\infty$. By applying $\mathcal{K}$ to the last limit, we find that $\tilde{x}=\mathcal{K}\tilde{y}$. If we show that $\mathcal{K}$ maps to $\mathcal{D}(A+B)$, then since $(A+B)\mathcal{K}\tilde{y}=\tilde{y}$ in the dense set $\bigcup_{\theta>0}(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,p}\cup(E,\mathcal{D}(B))_{\theta,p}$, we will have that the sum $A+B$ is closed. By (2.5), it is enough to show that $\mathcal{K}$ maps to one of the domains $\mathcal{D}(A)$ or $\mathcal{D}(B)$.

Since $\theta_A>\pi/2$, A generates an analytic continuous semigroup on E, which is defined by

$$e^{-wA}=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}}e^{w\lambda}(A+\lambda)^{-1}d\lambda,\ \text{ with } |\arg w|\le\theta_A-\frac{\pi}{2}.$$

For any $y\in E$, and $c<0$ sufficiently close to zero, by Fubini's theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}e^{-wA}y&=(\frac{1}{2\pi i})^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}}e^{w\lambda}(A+\lambda)^{-1}yd\lambda)dz\\ &=(\frac{1}{2\pi i})^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}}(B+z)^{-1}e^{w\lambda}(z+\lambda)^{-1}\big((A-z)^{-1}-(A+\lambda)^{-1}\big)yd\lambda dz\\ &=(\frac{1}{2\pi i})^2\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}}(A-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}e^{w\lambda}(z+\lambda)^{-1}yd\lambda dz\\ &\quad-(\frac{1}{2\pi i})^2\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}}\int_{c+\Gamma_{\theta_B}}(A+\lambda)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}e^{w\lambda}(z+\lambda)^{-1}ydzd\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy's theorem, the first term in the right hand side of the above equation is zero, and hence

$$\mathcal{K}e^{-wA}y=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}}(A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}e^{w\lambda}yd\lambda.$$

Since the integral

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}}A(A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}e^{w\lambda}yd\lambda$$

converges absolutely, $\mathcal{K}e^{-wA}y \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} A\mathcal{K}e^{-wA}y &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} A(A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}e^{w\lambda}yd\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} (A+\lambda-\lambda)(A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}e^{w\lambda}yd\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} (B-\lambda)^{-1}e^{w\lambda}yd\lambda - \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} (A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}\lambda e^{w\lambda}yd\lambda \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} (A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}\lambda e^{w\lambda}yd\lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where we have used again Cauchy's theorem.

Assume that the operator A admits a bounded $H^{e,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta_A)$-calculus. Let the sequence $\{e^{-w_nA}y\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, such that $|\arg w_n| \leq \theta_A - \frac{\pi}{2}$ for any n, and $w_n \to 0$ when $n \to \infty$. We have that

$$\mathcal{K}y = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{K}e^{-w_nA}y,$$

and by (2.6), that $\{A\mathcal{K}e^{-w_nA}y\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy by the assumption on A. Thus, the limit of $A\mathcal{K}e^{-w_nA}y$ when $n \to \infty$ exists and by the closedness of A, $\mathcal{K}y \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. □

We define next a bounded operator valued H^∞-calculus similar to that one in [4].

Definition 2.5. *(Bounded operator valued $H^\infty(\theta)$-calculus) Let E be a Banach space and $A \in \mathcal{P}(\theta)$. Denote by $H^\infty_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$ the space of all bounded holomorphic functions $f : \mathbb{C}\setminus S_\theta \to \mathcal{L}(E)$ such that $f(\lambda)$ and $(A+z)^{-1}$ commute for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\setminus S_\theta$ and $z \in S_\theta$, and by $H^{0,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$ its subspace consisting of functions f satisfying*

$$\sup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{C}\setminus S_\theta}(|\lambda|^\delta + |\lambda|^{-\delta})\|f(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(E)} < \infty,$$

for some δ depending on f. Any $f \in H^{0,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$ can be extended to non-tangential values in ∂S_θ, and we can define an element in $\mathcal{L}(E)$ by

$$f(-A) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_\theta} f(\lambda)(A+\lambda)^{-1}d\lambda.$$

We say that A admits a bounded $H^\infty_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$-calculus if $\|f(A)\|_{\mathcal{L}(E)} \leq C\|f\|_\infty$ for any $f \in H^{0,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$, where C is independent of f and $\|f\|_\infty$ is the supremum norm of $\|f(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(E)}$. Then, similarly to section II.9 in [5], $f(-A)$ can be extended to a map from $H^\infty_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$ to $\mathcal{L}(E)$.

Let us assume that the operator A from Theorem 2.1 admits a bounded $H^\infty_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta_A)$-calculus. For any $y \in E$, let the sequence $\{A^{-\theta_n}y\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, such that $\theta_n > 0$ for any n, and $\theta_n \to 0$ when $n \to \infty$. We have that

$$\mathcal{K}y = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{K}A^{-\theta_n}y,$$

and by (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} A\mathcal{K}A^{-\theta_n}y &= A\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} (A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta_n}yd\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} (A+\lambda-\lambda)(A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta_n}yd\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} (B-\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta_n}yd\lambda + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\theta_A}} (A+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{1-\theta_n}yd\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right hand site of the above equation is zero by Cauchy's theorem and the limit $A\mathcal{K}A^{-\theta_n}y$ when $n \to \infty$ exists by the assumption on A. Hence, by the closedness of A, $\mathcal{K}y \in \mathcal{D}(A)$.

Similarly, if B admits a bounded $H^\infty_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta_B)$-calculus, we consider the sequence $\{B^{-\theta_n}y\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. We have again that

$$\mathcal{K}y = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{K}B^{-\theta_n}y,$$

and by (2.4)

$$\begin{aligned}
B\mathcal{K}B^{-\theta_n}y &= B\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta_n}yd\lambda\\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda-\lambda)(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta_n}yd\lambda\\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(A-\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{-\theta_n}yd\lambda+\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\rho,\theta_B}}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(A-\lambda)^{-1}(-\lambda)^{1-\theta_n}yd\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right hand site of the above equation is again zero by Cauchy's theorem and the limit $B\mathcal{K}B^{-\theta_n}y$ when $n\to\infty$ exists by the assumption on B. Thus, by the closedness of B, $\mathcal{K}y\in\mathcal{D}(B)$. Hence, we find the following result similar to the Proposition 2.7 in [6].

Proposition 2.1. *Let E be a Banach space, $A\in\mathcal{P}(\theta_A)$ and $B\in\mathcal{P}(\theta_B)$ be resolvent commuting with $\theta_A\geq\theta_B$ and $\theta_A+\theta_B>\pi$. Let also $\mathcal{K}$ be the bounded operator defined in (2.2). If A admits a bounded $H^{\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta_A)$-calculus or B admits a bounded $H^{\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta_B)$-calculus, then $\mathcal{K}y\in\mathrm{D}(A)\cap\mathrm{D}(B)$ for any $y\in E$ and*

$$\overline{(A+B)}=A+B.$$

3. The abstract parabolic problem

Let the operator $B=\partial_t$ in $L^p(0,T;E)$ with $\mathcal{D}(B)=\{f(t)\in W^{1,p}(0,T;E)\,|\,f(0)=0\}$, for some $p\in(1,\infty)$ and $T>0$. We have that $\sigma(B)=\emptyset$ and

$$(B+\lambda)^{-1}g=\int_0^t e^{\lambda(x-t)}g(x)dx,\ \ \forall\lambda\in\mathbb{C}, \tag{3.7}$$

where by the Young's inequality for convolution, we infer that

$$\|(B+\lambda)^{-1}\|\leq\frac{1-e^{-\mathrm{Re}(\lambda)T}}{\mathrm{Re}(\lambda)},\ \ \forall\lambda\in\mathbb{C}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 2.1 we get the following result on the maximal L^p-regularity

Theorem 3.1. *Let E be a Banach space and $A\in\mathcal{P}(\theta)$ with $\theta>\frac{\pi}{2}$. Then, the following Cauchy problem*

$$f'(t)+Af(t)=g(t),\ \ f(0)=0,\ \ \textit{in}\ L^p(0,T;E),\ \ \textit{with}\ g(t)\in L^p(0,T;E),$$

for any $p>1$ and finite $T>0$, has a unique solution $f\in\bigcap_{\theta<1}W^{\theta,p}(0,T;E)\cap L^p(0,T;(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,q})$, for any $q\geq1$, depending continuously on g, which is given by

$$f(t)=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_\theta}\int_0^t(A+z)^{-1}e^{z(t-x)}g(x)dxdz,\quad\forall t\in[0,T].$$

If $g\in\bigcup_{\theta>0}W^{\theta,p}(0,T;E)\cup L^p(0,T;(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,q})$ for some $q\geq1$, then $f\in W^{1,p}(0,T;E)\cap L^p(0,T;\mathcal{D}(A))$. Moreover, if A admits a bounded $H^{e,\infty}_{\mathcal{L}(E)}(\theta)$-calculus, then $f\in W^{1,p}(0,T;E)\cap L^p(0,T;\mathcal{D}(A))$ for any $g\in L^p(0,T;E)$.

By the Riemann-Lebesque lemma (see section III.4.2 in [1]), the Fourier transform of a function in $L^1(\mathbb{R};E)$ vanish at infinity. Thus, if $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda)\geq k$ for some $k\in\mathbb{R}$, then

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\|(B+\lambda)^{-1}g\|=0,\ \ \forall g\in L^p(0,T;E). \tag{3.8}$$

Moreover

$$\|(B+\lambda)^{-1}\|=O(1),\ \ \text{when}\ \ \mathrm{Re}(\lambda)\geq k,\ \ \forall k\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.9}$$

Next, we will show that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}+k}(B+z)^{-1}g(t)dz=\frac{g(x)}{2},\ \ \forall g(x)\in W^{1,p}(0,T;E)\ \text{and}\ \forall k\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.10}$$

The independence of k follows by (3.8). We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}}(B+z)^{-1}g(t)dz &= \lim_{r\to\infty}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-ir}^{ir}\int_{0}^{x}e^{-z(x-t)}g(t)dtdz\\ &= \lim_{r\to\infty}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{0}^{x}g(t)\frac{\sin r(x-t)}{x-t}dt = \lim_{r\to\infty}\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{0}^{x}g(x-\nu)\frac{\sin r\nu}{\nu}d\nu.\end{aligned}$$

Since any $g \in W^{1,p}(0,T;E)$ has bounded variation (see Theorem 8.17 in [8]), by Lemma 5.2 in the Appendix we get that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}}(B+z)^{-1}g(t)dz = \frac{g(x-)}{2} = \frac{g(x)}{2},$$

since g is left continuous at every point (see Theorem 8.17 in [8]).

4. The abstract hyperbolic problem

Definition 4.1. *Let E be a Banach space, $c>0$ and $K\geq 1$. Let $\mathcal{Q}_K(c)$ be the class of closed linear operators in E such that if $A\in\mathcal{Q}_K(c)$, then $A\in\mathcal{P}(0)$,*

$$\Pi_c = \{z\in\mathbb{C}\,|\,\mathrm{Re}(z)\geq c-\frac{(\mathrm{Im}(z))^2}{4c}\}\subset\rho(-A) \quad \text{and} \quad (1+|z|)\|(A+z)^{-1}\|\leq K, \quad \forall z\in\Pi_c.$$

Also, let $\mathcal{Q}(c)=\cup_K\mathcal{Q}_K(c)$.

For the above class of operators, we have the following

Theorem 4.1. *Let E be a Banach space and $A\in\mathcal{Q}(c^2)$, for some $c>0$. Then, the following Cauchy problem*

$$f''(t)+Af(t)=g(t), \;\; f(0)=f'(0)=0, \;\; \text{in } L^p(0,T;E),$$

with

$$g\in W^{2,p}(0,T;E)\cap L^p(0,T;(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,q}), \;\; g(0),g'(0)\in\mathcal{D}(A) \;\; \text{and} \;\; Ag(0),Ag'(0)\in(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,q},$$

for any $p>1$, $q\geq 1$, $\theta>\frac{1}{2}$ and finite $T>0$, has a unique solution $f(t)\in W^{2,p}(0,T;E)\cap L^p(0,T;\mathcal{D}(A))$ depending continuously on g, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned}f(t)={}&\frac{t^3}{6}g'(0)+\frac{t^2}{2}g(0)\\ &+\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}\int_0^t(A+z^2)^{-1}e^{z(x-t)}\big(g(x)-\frac{x^3}{6}Ag'(0)-\frac{x^2}{2}Ag(0)-xg'(0)-g(0)\big)dxdz, \;\; \forall t\in[0,T].\end{aligned}$$

Proof. If B is the operator from the previous section, then the problem becomes $(B^2+A)f=g$ in $L^p(0,T;E)$. Moreover, by substituting $f(t)=\frac{t^3}{6}g'(0)+\frac{t^2}{2}g(0)+u(t)$, we see that we can assume that $g(0)=g'(0)=0$. Let the operator $\sqrt{A}$, defined by the the standard way of the fractional powers of A. By the relation

$$(\pm i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}=z(A+z^2)^{-1}\mp iA(A+z^2)^{-1}A^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{4.11}$$

and the assumption, $(\pm i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}$ is defined on the area $\{z\in\mathbb{C}\,|\,\mathrm{Re}(z)\leq -c\}$, since the last is mapped by the $z\to z^2$ to Π_{c^2}. If $\tilde{g}\in\mathcal{D}(\sqrt{A})$, then since by I.2.9.6 and I.2.5.2 in [1], $A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mp i\sqrt{A}+I)\tilde{g}\in(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\eta,q}$, for any $0<\eta<\frac{1}{2}$ and $q\in[1,\infty)$, by Lemma 5.3 in the Appendix and the decay property of the resolvent of A in Π_{c^2}, we have that $iA(A+z^2)^{-1}A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mp i\sqrt{A}+\tilde{c}I)\tilde{g}$, and hence by (4.11), $(\pm i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}(\mp i\sqrt{A}+I)\tilde{g}$, decays like $z^{-\eta'}$ in $\{z\in\mathbb{C}\,|\,\mathrm{Re}(z)\leq -c\}$ for any $0<\eta'<1$. Thus, by holomorphicity we have that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}\big((\pm i\sqrt{A}-\lambda)^{-1}-(I-\lambda)^{-1}\big)\tilde{g}d\lambda\\ &\quad=\lim_{r\to\infty}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-c+C_{r,\frac{\pi}{2},\frac{3\pi}{2}}}(I-\lambda)^{-1}(\pm i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(\mp i\sqrt{A}+I)\tilde{g}dz=0,\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{r,\frac{\pi}{2},\frac{3\pi}{2}}$ is defined in Lemma 5.4. By the same lemma, we also have that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(I-\lambda)^{-1}\tilde{g}d\lambda=\frac{1}{2}\tilde{g}.$$

Hence, we find that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(\pm i\sqrt{A}-\lambda)^{-1}\tilde{g}d\lambda=\frac{1}{2}\tilde{g}. \tag{4.12}$$

Let the family $y_{\lambda,z}(h)\in L^p(0,T;E)$, defined for $\lambda\in i\mathbb{R}-c$, $z\in i\mathbb{R}-c'$, with $c'>c>0$, and for any $h\in L^p(0,T;E)$ by

$$y_{\lambda,z}(h)=(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(-i\sqrt{A}-\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}h.$$

There is

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\lambda,z}(h)&=[(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}+(-i\sqrt{A}-\lambda)^{-1}](z+\lambda)^{-1}[(B+z)^{-1}-(B+\lambda)^{-1}](z-\lambda)^{-1}h\\ &=(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(z+\lambda)^{-1}(z-\lambda)^{-1}h-(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(z+\lambda)^{-1}(z-\lambda)^{-1}h\\ &-(i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(z+\lambda)^{-1}(z-\lambda)^{-1}h+(i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(z+\lambda)^{-1}(z-\lambda)^{-1}h. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

The decay property of the resolvent of A in Π_{c^2} and (4.11), imply boundedness of $(\pm i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}$ in $\{z\in\mathbb{C}\,|\,\mathrm{Re}(z)\leq -c\}$. Hence, by (3.9) and (4.13), we see that the integral of $y_{\lambda,z}(h)$ over $\{i\mathbb{R}-c\}\times\{i\mathbb{R}-c'\}$ converges absolutely.

Let the bounded in $L^p(0,T;E)$ operator $\mathcal{M}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{M}=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{\{i\mathbb{R}-c\}\times\{i\mathbb{R}-c'\}}y_{\lambda,z}(\cdot)d\lambda dz.$$

Take $g(t)\in W^{2,p}(0,T;E)\cap L^p(0,T;(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,q})$ with $q\geq 1$, $\theta>\frac{1}{2}$ and $g(0)=g'(0)=0$. Since $B^2y_{\lambda,z}(g)=y_{\lambda,z}(B^2g)$, the integral

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{\{i\mathbb{R}-c\}\times\{i\mathbb{R}-c'\}}B^2y_{\lambda,z}(g)d\lambda dz$$

converges absolutely. Thus, we have that $\mathcal{M}(g)\in\mathcal{D}(B^2)$ and

$$B^2\mathcal{M}(g)=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{\{i\mathbb{R}-c\}\times\{i\mathbb{R}-c'\}}B^2y_{\lambda,z}(g)d\lambda dz. \tag{4.14}$$

Also, by I.2.5.2 and I.2.9.6 in [1], $g\in\mathcal{D}(\sqrt{A})$, so that $Ay_{\lambda,z}(g)=\sqrt{A}y_{\lambda,z}(\sqrt{A}g)$. By (4.11),

$$\sqrt{A}(\pm i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}=zA(A+z^2)^{-1}A^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mp iA(A+z^2)^{-1},$$

and hence,

$$\sqrt{A}(\pm i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}\sqrt{A}g=zA(A+z^2)^{-1}g\mp iA(A+z^2)^{-1}\sqrt{A}g.$$

Since $g\in(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\theta,q}$ by Lemma 5.3 in the Appendix $A(A+z^2)^{-1}g$ decays like $z^{-2\theta'}$ in $\partial\Pi_{c^2}$, for any $\frac{1}{2}<\theta'<\theta$. Thus, $\sqrt{A}(\pm i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}\sqrt{A}g$ is bounded in $i\mathbb{R}-c$ or $i\mathbb{R}-c'$, and by (3.9) and (4.13), the integral

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{\{i\mathbb{R}-c\}\times\{i\mathbb{R}-c'\}}Ay_{\lambda,z}(g)d\lambda dz$$

converges absolutely. Hence, $\mathcal{M}(g)\in\mathcal{D}(A)$ and

$$A\mathcal{M}(g)=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{\{i\mathbb{R}-c\}\times\{i\mathbb{R}-c'\}}Ay_{\lambda,z}(g)d\lambda dz. \tag{4.15}$$

By (4.14) and (4.15), we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(B^2+A)\mathcal{M}(g) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(B^2+A)y_{\lambda,z}(g)d\lambda dz\\
&= \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(B-i\sqrt{A})(B+\lambda)^{-1}(-i\sqrt{A}-\lambda)^{-1}(B+i\sqrt{A})(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}gd\lambda dz\\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}\Big(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}\big((B+\lambda)^{-1}+(-i\sqrt{A}-\lambda)^{-1}\big)(B+i\sqrt{A})(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}gd\lambda\Big)dz.
\end{aligned}
$$

By (3.10) and (4.12) with $\tilde{g}=(B+i\sqrt{A})(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}g$, the above equation becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
(B^2+A)\mathcal{M}(g) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}(B+z+i\sqrt{A}-z)(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}gdz\\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}\big((i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}+(B+z)^{-1}\big)gdz = g,
\end{aligned}
$$

where at the last step we have used again (3.10) and (4.12) with $\tilde{g}=g$.

Now, for any $h\in L^p(0,T;E)$, by (4.13), Fubini's theorem and Cauchy's theorem we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}h = & \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(z+\lambda)^{-1}(z-\lambda)^{-1}hd\lambda dz\\
& -\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(z+\lambda)^{-1}(z-\lambda)^{-1}hd\lambda dz\\
& -\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}(i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}(z+\lambda)^{-1}(z-\lambda)^{-1}hdzd\lambda\\
& +\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}(i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}(z+\lambda)^{-1}(z-\lambda)^{-1}hdzd\lambda\\
= & -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}\frac{1}{2z}hdz+\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c'}(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}(B-z)^{-1}\frac{1}{2z}hdz\\
& +\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\frac{1}{2\lambda}hd\lambda-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(B-\lambda)^{-1}\frac{1}{2\lambda}hd\lambda\\
& -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\frac{1}{2\lambda}hd\lambda+\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(i\sqrt{A}+\lambda)^{-1}(B+\lambda)^{-1}\frac{1}{2\lambda}hd\lambda\\
= & \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}\big((i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}-(i\sqrt{A}-z)^{-1}\big)(B+z)^{-1}\frac{1}{2z}hdz\\
= & \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{i\mathbb{R}-c}(A+z^2)^{-1}(B+z)^{-1}hdz,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have also used the decay of $(\pm i\sqrt{A}+z)^{-1}$ in the area $\{z\in\mathbb{C}\,|\,\mathrm{Re}(z)\leq -c\}$ (which follows by (4.11) and Lemma 5.3 in the Appendix) and (3.9). The result now follows by (3.7). □

5. Appendix

Lemma 5.1.

$$
\frac{\pi}{ab(a+b)}=\int_{\mathbb{R}}(a^2+\lambda^2)^{-1}(b^2+\lambda^2)^{-1}d\lambda, \quad a,b>0.
$$

Proof. Let the family over $t>0$ of functions $f_t(x)=e^{-t|x|}$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$, and the Fourier transform over x given by $\widehat{f_t(x)}(\lambda)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{-2\pi i\lambda x}f_t(x)dx$, with inverse $f_t(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{2\pi i\lambda x}\widehat{f_t(x)}(\lambda)d\lambda$. There is

$$
\widehat{f_t(x)}(\lambda)=\frac{2t}{t^2+4\pi^2\lambda^2}.
$$

By the convolution theorem $\widehat{f_a * f_b}=\widehat{f}_a\cdot\widehat{f}_b$, we get that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{-a|x|}e^{-b|z-x|}dx=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{4ab}{(a^2+4\pi^2\lambda^2)(b^2+4\pi^2\lambda^2)}e^{2\pi i\lambda z}d\lambda,
$$

where at $z=0$ it becomes

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{4ab}{(a^2+4\pi^2\lambda^2)(b^2+4\pi^2\lambda^2)} d\lambda = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-(a+b)|x|} dx = e^{-\widehat{(a+b)|x|}}(0) = \frac{2}{a+b}.$$

□

Lemma 5.2. *If $g(t)$ has bounded variation in $[0,a]$, then*

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^a g(t) \frac{\sin rt}{t} dt = \frac{g(0+)}{2},$$

where $g(0+) = \lim_{t\to 0} g(t)$.

Proof. Lemma 7.1 in [9] □

The following well known argument can also be found in section III.4.6 in [1].

Sectoriality extension argument: Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be closed and connected, and A be a closed linear operator in a Banach space E such that $\Omega \subset \rho(-A)$ and $(1+|z|)\|(A+z)^{-1}\| \leq K$, for any $z \in \Omega$ and some $K \geq 1$. Let the set

$$\Omega' = \cup_{\lambda\in\Omega}\{z \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, |z-\lambda| \leq (1+|\lambda|)/2K\}.$$

Then, by the relation

$$A+z = (A+\lambda)\big(I+(z-\lambda)(A+\lambda)^{-1}\big),$$

we have that $(A+z)^{-1}$ is defined in Ω' and

$$\begin{aligned}\|(A+z)^{-1}\| &\leq \|\big(I+(z-\lambda)(A+\lambda)^{-1}\big)^{-1}\|\|(A+\lambda)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{2K}{1+|\lambda|}\\ &\leq \frac{2K(1+|\lambda|+|z-\lambda|)}{(1+|\lambda|)(1+|z|)} \leq \frac{2K}{(1+|z|)}(1+\frac{1}{2K}) = \frac{2K+1}{1+|z|}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let A be a closed linear operator in a Banach space E such that $\Omega \subset \rho(-A)$ and $(1+|z|)\|(A+z)^{-1}\| \leq K$, for any $z \in \Omega$ and some $K \geq 1$, where $[0,+\infty) \subset \Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ is closed and connected such that $\partial\Omega = \{\gamma(t) \in \mathbb{C}\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is a piece-wise smooth simple curve with $|\gamma(t)| \to \infty$ when $t \to \pm\infty$. Then, if $y \in (E, \mathcal{D}(A))_{p,\phi}$ for some $p \in [1,\infty)$ and $\phi \in (0,1)$, we have that $z^\theta A(A+z)^{-1}y$ is bounded in Ω for any $\theta < \phi$.*

Proof. By I.2.5.2 and I.2.9.6 in [1] we have that $x \in \mathcal{D}(A^{\theta'})$ for some $\theta < \theta' < \phi$. By a sectoriality extension argument we have that $(1+|z|)\|(A+z)^{-1}\| \leq K'$ for any $z \in \Omega' \supset \Omega$ and some $K' > K$, such that $\partial\Omega'$ is also a piece-wise smooth simple curve which does not intersect $\partial\Omega$. There exists an $x \in E$ such that

$$y = A^{-\theta'}x = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\partial\Omega'} (-\lambda)^{-\theta'}(A+\lambda)^{-1}x d\lambda.$$

Hence, for any $z \in \Omega$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}z^\theta A(A+z)^{-1}y &= \frac{z^\theta}{2\pi i} A \int_{\partial\Omega'} (-\lambda)^{-\theta'}(A+z)^{-1}(A+\lambda)^{-1}x d\lambda\\
&= \frac{z^\theta}{2\pi i} A \int_{\partial\Omega'} \frac{(-\lambda)^{-\theta'}}{\lambda - z}\big((A+z)^{-1} - (A+\lambda)^{-1}\big)x d\lambda\\
&= \frac{z^\theta}{2\pi i} A(A+z)^{-1} \int_{\partial\Omega'} \frac{(-\lambda)^{-\theta'}}{\lambda - z} x d\lambda - \frac{z^\theta}{2\pi i} A \int_{\partial\Omega'} \frac{(-\lambda)^{-\theta'}}{\lambda - z}(A+\lambda)^{-1}x d\lambda\\
&= -\frac{z^\theta}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial\Omega'} \frac{(-\lambda)^{-\theta'}}{\lambda - z}(A+\lambda-\lambda)(A+\lambda)^{-1}x d\lambda\\
&= -\frac{z^\theta}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial\Omega'} \frac{(-\lambda)^{-\theta'}}{\lambda - z} x d\lambda + \frac{z^\theta}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial\Omega'} \frac{\lambda(-\lambda)^{-\theta'}}{\lambda - z}(A+\lambda)^{-1}x d\lambda\\
&= \frac{z^\theta}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial\Omega'} \frac{\lambda(-\lambda)^{-\theta'}}{\lambda - z}(A+\lambda)^{-1}x d\lambda,\end{aligned}$$

where the first term in the third and fifth line are zero by Cauchy's theorem. Hence, we find that

$$z^{\theta}A(A+z)^{-1}y=-\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\partial\Omega'}\frac{(\frac{\lambda}{z})^{1-\theta}}{1+\frac{\lambda}{z}}(\lambda)^{-(\theta'-\theta)}(A-\lambda)^{-1}xd\lambda.$$

Since the distance of z from $\partial\Omega'$ cannot become arbitrary small (see III.4.7.11 in [1]), we have that $\frac{(\frac{\lambda}{z})^{1-\theta}}{1+\frac{\lambda}{z}}$ is bounded as a function of $\lambda\in-\partial\Omega'$ uniformly in $z\in\Omega$. □

Lemma 5.4. *(Sectorial projection) Let E be a Banach space and $A\in\mathcal{P}(\theta)$. Then, for any $x\in(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\eta,q}$, with $\eta\in(0,1)$ and $q\in[1,\infty)$, there is*

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\theta}}(A+\lambda)^{-1}xd\lambda=2\theta ix.$$

Proof. If $C_{r,\theta_1,\theta_2}=\{z\in\mathbb{C}\,|\,|z|=r\text{ and }\theta_1\leq\arg z\leq\theta_2\}$, for some $r>0$ and $\theta_1,\theta_2\in\mathbb{R}$, then by Cauchy's theorem we have that

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\theta}}(1+\lambda)^{-1}d\lambda=\lim_{r\to\infty}\int_{C_{r,-\theta,\theta}}(1+\lambda)^{-1}d\lambda=\lim_{r\to\infty}\int_{-\theta}^{\theta}(1+re^{i\phi})^{-1}ire^{i\phi}d\phi$$
$$=\lim_{r\to\infty}\int_{-\theta}^{\theta}\partial_{\phi}\ln(1+re^{i\phi})d\phi=\lim_{r\to\infty}\ln\frac{1+re^{i\theta}}{1+re^{-i\theta}}=2\theta i.$$

If $x\in(E,\mathcal{D}(A))_{\eta,q}$ for some $\eta\in(0,1)$ and $q\in[1,\infty)$, then by the previous lemma, $|\lambda^{\eta'}|\|A(A+\lambda)^{-1}x\|$ is bounded whenever $\|\lambda(A+\lambda)^{-1}\|$ is, for any $0<\eta'<\eta$. Thus, by Cauchy's theorem

$$\begin{aligned}\|\int_{\Gamma_{\theta}}(1+\lambda)^{-1}(I-A)(A+\lambda)^{-1}xd\lambda\|&=\|\lim_{r\to\infty}\int_{C_{r,-\theta,\theta}}(1+\lambda)^{-1}(I-A)(A+\lambda)^{-1}xd\lambda\|\\ \leq&\lim_{r\to\infty}\int_{C_{r,-\theta,\theta}}|(1+\lambda)^{-1}|\|(I-A)(A+\lambda)^{-1}x\|d\lambda\\ \leq&\lim_{r\to\infty}\sup_{\phi\in(-\theta,\theta)}\frac{2\theta r}{\sqrt{1+r^2+2r\cos\phi}}\sup_{\phi\in(-\theta,\theta)}\|(I-A)(A+re^{i\phi})^{-1}x\|=0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}2\theta ix&=\int_{\Gamma_{\theta}}(1+\lambda)^{-1}xd\lambda+\int_{\Gamma_{\theta}}(1+\lambda)^{-1}(I-A)(A+\lambda)^{-1}xd\lambda\\&=\int_{\Gamma_{\theta}}(1+\lambda)^{-1}\big(I+(I-A)(A+\lambda)^{-1}\big)xd\lambda=\int_{\Gamma_{\theta}}(A+\lambda)^{-1}xd\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

□

References

[1] H. Amann, *Linear and quasilinear parabolic problems*. Monographs in Mathematics Vol. 89, Birkhäuser Verlag (1995).

[2] P. Clément and S. Li, *Abstract parabolic quasilinear equations and application to a groundwater flow problem*. Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. 3 (1993/94), Special Issue, 17–32.

[3] G. Dore and A. Venni, *On the closedness of the sum of two closed operators*. Math. Z. 196 (1987), no. 2, 189–201.

[4] N. Kalton and L. Weis, *The H^{∞}-calculus and sums of closed operators*. Math. Ann. 321 (2001), no. 2, 319–345.

[5] P. Kunstmann and L. Weis, *Maximal L_p-regularity for Parabolic Equations, Fourier Multiplier Theorems and H^{∞}-functional Calculus*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer (2004).

[6] F. Lancien, G. Lancien and C. Le Merdy, *A joint functional calculus for sectorial operators with commuting resolvents*. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 77 (1998), no. 2, 387–414.

[7] G. Da Prato and P. Grisvard, *Sommes d'opérateurs linéaires et équations différentielles opérationnelles*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 54 (1975), no. 3, 305–387.

[8] W. Rudin *Real and complex analysis*. McGraw-Hill (1970).

[9] D. Widder, *An introduction to transform theory*. Academic Press (1971).

Institut für Analysis, Leibniz Universität Hannover, Welfengarten 1, 30167 Hannover, Germany
E-mail address: `roidos@math.uni-hannover.de`